

## Homework 10

LIN 311: Syntax, Fall 2018

### Problem 1. Principle A.

(Based on Carnie, Ch. 5, GPS4, Ch. 17, GPS1)

Explain the grammaticality status of the following sentences. For each sentence, say what the binding domain of the anaphor is, whether it is c-commanded by its binder (antecedent), and if and why the Condition A is violated. One line answer for each of the sentences should be sufficient!

- (1) a. \* $[_{TP} [_{DP} \text{Michael}_i\text{'s father}]_j \text{ loves himself}_i]$ .
- b. \* $[_{TP_2} \text{Susan}_i \text{ thinks that } [_{TP_1} \text{John should marry herself}_i]]$ .
- c. \* $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ thinks that } [_{TP_1} [_{DP} \text{Mary's depiction of himself}_i] \text{ is wrong}]]$ .
- d.  $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ thinks that } [_{TP_1} [_{DP} \text{most depictions of himself}_i] \text{ are wrong}]]$ .
- e. \* $[_{TP} \text{John}_i \text{ loves } [_{DP} \text{Mary's pictures of himself}_i]]$ .
- f.  $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ believes } [_{TP_1} \text{himself}_i \text{ to be the best at baseball}]]$ .
- g.  $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ wants } [_{CP} [_{TP_1} \text{to congratulate himself}_i]]]$ . (Hint: Remember PRO!!!)

### Problem 2. Principle B.

(Based on Carnie, Ch. 5, GPS4, Ch. 17, GPS1)

Explain the grammaticality status of the following sentences. For each sentence, say what the binding domain of the pronoun is, whether it is c-commanded by its binder (antecedent), and if and why the Condition B is violated. One line answer for each of the sentences should be sufficient!

- (2) a. \* $[_{TP} \text{Michael}_i \text{ loves him}_i]$ .
- b.  $[_{TP} [_{DP} \text{Michael}_i\text{'s father}]_j \text{ loves him}_i]$ .
- c.  $[_{TP} \text{John}_i \text{ loves } [_{DP} \text{his}_i \text{ puppy}]]$ .
- d. \* $[_{TP_2} \text{John thinks that } [_{TP_1} \text{Susan}_i \text{ should kiss her}_i]]$ .
- e.  $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ asked if } [_{TP_1} [_{DP_2} \text{the unflattering description of } [_{DP_1} \text{his}_i \text{ work}]] \text{ would be published}]]$ .
- f. \* $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ believes } [_{TP_1} \text{him}_i \text{ to be fantastic}]]$ .
- g. \* $[_{TP_2} \text{John}_i \text{ wants } [_{CP} [_{TP_1} \text{to kiss him}_i]]]$ . (Hint: Remember PRO!!!)

### Problem 3. Binding in Persian.

(Based on Carnie, Ch. 5, CPS3)

Does the binding theory account for the following data? Explain. What is the binding domain of *xodesh*? (*Râ* means *the* when following object DPs.)

- (1)  $\text{Jân}_i \text{ goft } [_{CP} \text{ke } [_{TP} \text{Mery}_k \text{ ketâb-â ro be } \text{xodesh}_{i/k} \text{ bargardune}]]$ .  
John said that Mary book-PL *râ* to himself/herself return  
“John said that Mary (should) return the books to him/herself.”
- (2)  $\text{Jân}_i \text{ goft } [_{CP} \text{ke } [_{TP} \text{Mery}_j \text{ ketâb-â ro be } \text{xodesh}_{i/j} \text{ barmigardune}]]$ .  
John said that Mary book-PL *râ* to himself/herself return.3SG.FUT  
“John said that Mary will return the books to him/herself.”

Now consider (3) and (4): in these examples, *xod* ‘self’ instead of *xodesh* ‘himself’ is used. How do you explain the contrast between (1) and (2) on one side and (3) and (4) on the other? What is the difference in binding domains between *xodesh* and *xod*?

- (3) **Jân<sub>i</sub>** goft [<sub>CP</sub> ke [<sub>TP</sub> **Mery<sub>k</sub>** ketâb râ barâye **xod<sub>\*i/k</sub>** bexânad]].  
 John said that Mary book râ for self read.3SG  
 “John said that Mary (should) read the book to \*himself/herself.”
- (4) **Jân<sub>i</sub>** goft [<sub>CP</sub> ke [<sub>TP</sub> **Mery<sub>k</sub>** ketâb râ barâye **xod<sub>\*i/k</sub>** negahdârad]].  
 John said that Mary book râ for self keep.3SG  
 “John said that Mary (should) keep the books for \*himself/herself.”

## Problem 4.\* Binding and Movement.

### Part 1.

Consider the following raising sentences. Sentences in (1) are grammatical, while the ones in (2) are ungrammatical.

- (1) a. **Katie<sub>k</sub>** seems to **herself<sub>k</sub>** to be too fond of geese.  
 b. **[Katie and Chelsea]<sub>i</sub>** seem to **[each other]<sub>i</sub>** to be too fond of geese.
- (2) a. \***Katie<sub>k</sub>** seems to **Katie<sub>k</sub>** to be too fond of geese.  
 b. \***Katie<sub>k</sub>** seems to **her<sub>k</sub>** to be too fond of geese.  
 c. \***She<sub>k</sub>** seems to **Katie<sub>k</sub>** to be too fond of geese.  
 d. \***She<sub>k</sub>** seems to **her<sub>k</sub>** to be too fond of geese.

Recall the raising analysis of *seem*-sentences. Note that in the lecture notes we did not mention how binding theory interacts with movements, i.e. whether Principles of Binding Theory should be satisfied prior to movement or after them. What conclusions can be made based on the data above? How can we account for the (un)acceptability of (1)-(2)?

### Part 2.

This brings us to the next set of observations. Assume that the sentences like

- (3) Mary, John loves.

are derived by movement of the object from its base position (the complement of V) to the Spec,CP position (similar to German, except without V-to-C raising): a movement that is called *topicalization*.

Now consider the binding facts below:

- (4) a. \*A picture of **itself<sub>r</sub>** fell on **[the robot]<sub>r</sub>**.  
 b. \***[The robot]<sub>r</sub>**, a picture of **itself<sub>r</sub>** fell on.

Likewise, the examples with reciprocals are equally unacceptable:

- (5) a. \***[Each other]<sub>i</sub>**'s geese bit **[Katie and Chelsea]<sub>i</sub>**.  
 b. \***[Katie and Chelsea]<sub>i</sub>**, **[each other]<sub>i</sub>**'s geese bit.

Given your analysis, and how it explained the observations in (1)-(2), are the observations in (4)-(5) expected? If so, explain exactly why. If not, go as far as you possibly can toward understanding why (4)-(5) are all unacceptable — and, in particular, how it can be that all four of these sentences are unacceptable in exactly the same universe in which (1)-(2) have the acceptability statuses that they do.